DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 401 SP 027 585

AUTHOR Berry, Barnett
TITLE Understanding Teacher Supply and Demand in the Southeast: A Synthesis of Qualitative Research to Aid Effective Policy Making. Occasional Papers in Educational Policy Analysis. Paper No. 420.
INSTITUTION Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, Research Triangle Park, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 57p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Choice; Faculty Mobility; *Labor Market; Policy Formation; Quality of Working Life; *Teacher Recruitment; *Teacher Supply and Demand; *Teaching (Occupation); *Teaching Conditions

ABSTRACT

A report is given of a series of qualitative studies conducted to clarify the market patterns of career choice and expectation, recruitment and selection, turnover and mobility, and working conditions and career alternatives of public school teachers. A study of the career expectations of noneducation college students was also made. These studies sought to delineate the dynamics undergirding the market forces so that policy makers may have a more effective framework for analyzing and remedying the problems confronting the occupation of teaching. Focus was upon: (1) labor market variables affecting present education students and teachers; (2) the mobility patterns of resigning teachers; and (3) the variables affecting the career choices of noneducation college students in high-demand fields. Over 525 teachers, former teachers, and administrators in school systems and education students, noneducation students, professors, and administrators in universities representing 22 institutions in rural and urban sites in three different southeastern states were interviewed or surveyed. Policy strategies for attracting and retaining effective teachers are suggested. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED269401

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
IN
EDUCATIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS

PAPER NO. 420

UNDERSTANDING TEACHER SUPPLY AND DEMAND IN THE SOUTHEAST: A SYNTHESIS OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH TO AID EFFECTIVE POLICY MAKING

Barnett Berry

November 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Willis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement

P.O. Box 12746 • 200 Park • Suite 204 • Research Triangle Park • North Carolina 27709 • (919) 549/8216

SP 025 785

This activity was supported in whole or in part by the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Education. The contents do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the U. S. Department of Education or the Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement member states' Departments of Education or their Chief State School Officers.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS

PAPER NO. 420

UNDERSTANDING TEACHER SUPPLY AND DEMAND IN THE SOUTHEAST: A SYNTHESIS OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH TO AID EFFECTIVE POLICY MAKING

Barnett Berry

November 1985

Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement
200 Park Offices, Suite 204, Post Office Box 12746
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709

919/549-8216

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The Setting and Methodology	3
A SYNTHESIS OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH	11
Career Choice and Expectations	13
Recruitment and Selection	16
Mobility and Attrition	23
Working Conditions	28
Organizational Disincentives for Teaching	34
UNDERSTANDING TEACHING	41
Strategies for Effective Policy Makers	43
REFERENCES	47

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
TABLE A	Study I: Background and Contextual Variables	5
TABLE B	Study II: Teacher Resignations (by Subject, Response Rate)	6
TABLE C	Study III: Inner-City School System Teacher Resignations (by Subject, Response Rate)	8
TABLE D	Study IV: Career Expectations Study Sample	9
TABLE E	Study V: Teacher Turnover in Rural School Systems	10
TABLE F	School System Applicants on File	18
TABLE G	Teacher Attrition: Percent of Resignee Sample by Reason	26
TABLE H	Where Teachers Went: Percent of Resignee Sample by Percent Occupation	27

Preface

The Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, as part of its research activities, has investigated several related topics regarding the teacher labor market issue. Included in these were qualitative studies that focused on areas that have not received much attention in the literature. Since these qualitative studies contributed to a different, but important, perspective in understanding the complex teacher labor market, the Southeastern Regional Council contracted with Dr. Barnett Berry to synthesize his work in one publication.

This occasional paper offers policy makers insights into factors affecting the supply of teachers that should be considered in their deliberations. For educational researchers interested in the teacher labor market, this synthesis suggests some research areas that have not been investigated sufficiently. Further work in these areas and others would provide a service to those who are now making decisions with often limited or inadequate information. The supply of teachers is critical in achieving the quality education we desire for our children.

UNDERSTANDING TEACHER SUPPLY AND DEMAND IN THE SOUTHEAST: A SYNTHESIS OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH TO AID EFFECTIVE POLICY MAKING

Introduction

The problems of the teacher labor market have been well publicized in the last few years. Critics of public education lament that many teachers cannot teach; those who do teach, don't for very long; and those who can teach, opt for other careers. Much of this criticism has emerged from numerous national reports such as A Nation at Risk (1983) and studies illuminating the declining academic ability of the teacher work force (Schlechty and Vance, 1983; Weaver, 1983; Darling-Hammond, 1984). Compounding this problem of teacher quality is the impending problem of an inadequate quantity of teachers due to dropping enrollments in teacher education programs and the increasing population of school-age children in the United States. Most researchers and policy makers attribute the cause of the problem to low salaries relative to other occupations, the opening of other career alternatives to women and minorities, few incentives and the lack of career advancement within the occupation, and the lack of social respect for teachers. However, Sykes and Devaney (1985) recently stated that:

> teaching's recruitment and retention problems extend beyond the ups and downs of the job market to the nature of the work itself and to the conditions that teachers face in the schools today (p. 243).

Since 1983, more than 700 pieces of state legislation directed toward enhancing teacher quality and improving the conditions of the teacher labor market have been developed (McLaughlin, et al., 1985). State education policy makers in the Southeast have been in the forefront of this national

teacher reform movement by enacting and proposing across-the-board pay increases, career ladders, and merit pay plans to reward quality teachers. The intent of these policy reforms is to attract and retain quality teachers so that the public schools will produce the caliber of educational outcomes necessary for the future economic prosperity of the region and the nation. While there are significant differences among these policies, McLaughlin, et al. (1985) note that current teacher reforms share a number of features:

1. The impetus for this round of educational reforms emerged not from within the teaching profession but from the broader political arena;

2. The present reforms are based primarily on solutions which, by political necessity, are applied across-the-board to entire classes of institutions and individuals; and

3. In many instances, the targets of policy--teachers--have had little or nothing to say about either the problem or the solution to it (pp. 1-2).

The current reform movement has (1) emerged from the perspective of an outsider and (2) focused more on political feasibility than contextual validity. However, given the idiosyncratic and complex characteristics regularly observed in the schools, the process of educational policy making should consider what Elmore and McLaughlin (1984) have labeled "backwards mapping." This strategy begins where the work is done and examines what would be required for the outcome or product to be effective, then moves backward to the organizational values and structures that are in the policy makers' control. This "requires a deep understanding of the nature of the work and of the work settings that policy seeks to influence" (Sykes and Devaney, 1985, p. 248).

Very little research has been conducted that adequately supports whether or not policies such as career ladders and merit pay would

positively alter the forces affecting the teacher labor market (Bird, 1984). Many of the "most profound problems plaguing the teaching profession remain inadequately diagnosed" and "many of the assumptions that underlie these suggested cures are unsupported by research on teaching" (Rosenholtz, 1985, p. 350). Therefore, with policy makers "estranged" from the "reality" of the work that policy attempts to regulate, "the tools proposed for government to prevent the threatened shortage of competent teachers are likely to be too blunt and dull to reach the roots of the problem" (Sykes and Devaney, 1985, p. 244).

Given this, the Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, in an effort to explore in-depth supply and demand variables in the region, commissioned a series of qualitative studies to better understand the market patterns of career choice and expectations, recruitment and selection, turnover and mobility, and working conditions and career alternatives of public school teachers. In addition, a study of the career expectations of noneducation college students was undertaken to better ascertain the efficacy of the current reform in attracting and retaining them as public school teachers. It was the intent of these studies to delineate both from an insider's perspective and the unique local conditions the dynamics undergirding market forces so that policy makers may have a more effective framework for analyzing and remedying the problems confronting the occupation of public school teaching.

The Setting and Methodology

Case study methodologies were utilized to describe and analyze the situational context of the teacher labor markets in the Southeast. These studies (conducted during 1984 and 1985) sought to illuminate: (1) the

labor market variables affecting present education students and teachers, (2) the mobility patterns of resigning teachers, and (3) the variables affecting the career choices of noneducation college students in high-demand fields. Over 525 teachers, former teachers, and administrators in school systems and education students, noneducation students, professors, and administrators in universities representing 22 institutions were interviewed or surveyed. The institutions were located in rural and urban sites in three different southeastern states.

The first study included six universities and six school systems representative of the geographic, economic, and cultural diversity in the region and focused on initial career choice, position availability, recruitment and selection processes, turnover and mobility patterns, and working conditions and alternatives of public school teachers. Interviews, document review, and field observations in the twelve sites were conducted. The informants interviewed (n = 180) included deans, professors, placement officers, and students in the education units of the universities and central office administrators, principals, and teachers in the school systems. Table A outlines significant background and contextual variables and the types of individuals interviewed (see Berry, 1984, for more details).

The second study tracked teachers who resigned from a metropolitan school system during the 1983-84 academic year. This study described who left, why they left, where they went, and what it would take to attract and retain these teachers in public education. Of the 210 teachers who had resigned (an approximate turnover rate of 5 percent), 82 were interviewed, and 45 of the remaining 128 responded to a mail survey, a 60 percent response rate. Table B exhibits the number of teachers leaving by subject area and the percentage of those interviewed or surveyed (response rate).

TABLE A

STUDY I: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES

INSTITUTION	CONTEXT	ENROLLMENT: *STUDENTS AND TEACHERS	INTERVIEWED (I)**
School System 1	Inner-City	30,000 S (75% Black) 20,000 T (60% White)	I = 25: A = 5 T = 20
School System 2	Metro	70,000 S (40% Black) 4,000 T (70% White)	I = 37: A = 7 T = 30
School System 3	Rural/Isolated	4,500 S (80% Black) 275 T (35% White)	I = 10: A = 4 T = 6
School System 4	Rural/Some Industry	5,500 S (56% Black) 320 T (62% White)	I = 16: A = 4 T = 12
School System 5	Suburban	24,000 S (18% Black) 1,300 T (86% White)	I = 11: A = 3 T = 8
School System 6	Rural/Site of State University/ Resort	5,000 S (17% Black) 270 T (99% White)	I = 13: A = 4 T = 9
University 1	Historically Black Institution/Rural Area	2,500 UE 240 ES	I = 12: A = 4 ES = 8
University 2	Former White Teachers College/Rural Area	13,000 UE 1,300 ES	I = 10: A = 2 ES = 8
University 3	Former White Female Teachers College/Metro Area	10,000 UE 800 ES	I = 11: A = 3 ES = 8
University 4	Former Teachers' College/College Town/Rural	10,000 UE 1,200 ES	I = 15: A = 4 ES = 11
University 5	Major Research University/ College Town/ Urban	20,000 UE 350 ES	I = 13: A = 4 ES = 9
University 6	Historically Black University	5,000 UE 250 ES	I = 12: A = 4 ES = 9

*S = Students (public school)
T = Teachers
ES = Undergraduate Education Enrollment
UE = University Enrollment

**A = School System Administrator or University Official/Professor
T = Teachers
ES = Education Students

TABLE B

STUDY II: TEACHER RESIGNATIONS
(BY SUBJECT, RESPONSE RATE)

SUBJECT	1983-84 RESIGNATIONS	RESPONSE RATE
K-6	33	55%
SE/Speech	28	71%
Math	28	57%
English	19	68%
Vocational	19	89%
Science	15	60%
PE/Health	14	64%
Music/Art	13	38%
SSS/GT	11	45%
Foreign Language	7	43%
Business	6	33%
Counselor/Staff	5	80%
Librarian	5	60%
Social Studies	4	0%
DE/ISS	3	100%
TOTAL	210	60%

CODE: SE = Special Education
PE = Physical Education
SSS = Specialist, School Psychologist
GT = Gifted and Talented
Staff = Staff Development
DE = Driver's Education
ISS = In-School Suspension

The third study included teachers who had resigned from an inner-city school system during the 1983-84 academic year. The same questions were explored as in the second study, except a mail survey was the only method of data collection. Of the 145 teachers who had resigned (an approximate turnover rate of 7 percent), 50 former teachers responded. Given that the initial pool of potential respondents was 122 teachers (the names and addresses of the 23 retirees for the 1983-84 school year were not provided for the researcher), this was a 41 percent response rate. Table C exhibits the number of teachers leaving by subject area and the percentage of those surveyed.

The fourth study investigated the career expectations of 80 non-education college seniors (from six representative colleges and universities in the region) in business, the sciences, math, engineering, and the humanities, and it analyzed factors for attracting and retaining these high-demand students in teaching. Average-achieving and high-achieving students (as identified by departmental chairs, GPAs, and SAT scores) were distinguished within the majors. Table D briefly outlines significant background and contextual variables regarding the institutions and the number of students interviewed by major area (for more details, see Berry, 1985b).

The fifth study investigated teacher turnover in rural school systems to better understand the problems facing this unique labor market. This study included in-depth personal and telephone interviews with teachers (37), administrators (10), and former teachers (41) in five school systems in two states in the Southeast. The teacher sample was drawn primarily from those presently teaching secondary math and science. The former teacher sample was drawn from the 1984-85 turnover in each of the five

TABLE C

STUDY III: INNER-CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM TEACHER RESIGNATIONS
(BY SUBJECT, RESPONSE RATE)

SUBJECT	1983-84 RESIGNATIONS	SURVEY RESPONSE RATE (EXCLUSION OF RETIREES)
K-6	61	30%
English	19	35%
Special Education	16	60%
Vocational	10	25%
Math	10	50%
Social Studies	7	33%
Science	5	60%
Art	5	40%
Music/Band	3	66%
PE	3	66%
Specialists	3	0%
Guidance	2	50%
Foreign Language	1	0%

school systems. This sample included a response rate that ranged from 54 to 100 percent. Table F briefly outlines significant background variables, the types of individuals interviewed, and the 1984-85 turnover for each of the 5 school systems.

TABLE D

STUDY IV: CAREER EXPECTATIONS STUDY SAMPLE

INSTITUTION	CONTEXT	UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT	NO. INTERVIEWED BY MAJOR				
			BUS.	SCI.	MATH	ENG.	SOC. SCI.
University 6*	Historically Black University/City/ Education Center	5,000	2	3	1	-	-
University 7	Regional State University/ Metro/Resort/ Well-Industrialized	14,000	5	9	-	5	-
University 8	Flagship of State University/ Capital City	20,000	5	3	5	3	2
University 9	State College/ Former Womens' Teacher College/ Rural Students	4,000	4	5	3	-	-
University 10	Prestigious Private College/ Urban Students	1,500	-	6	-	-	4
University 11	Church-Related Private College/New Graduate Programs/ Rural Students	2,600	4	6	5	-	1
TOTAL			20	32	14	8	7

*This institution was utilized in the first study.

TABLE E

STUDY V: TEACHER TURNOVER IN RURAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

INSTITUTION	CONTEXT	ENROLLMENT STUDENTS AND TEACHERS	1984-85 INTERVIEWED/ TURNOVER
School System 7	Poor Economy/Commuting Distance from Industrializing Small City/Very Rural/7 Other Districts in County	550 S (50% White) 40 T (50% Black)	I = 13: A = 3 T = 5 FT = 5 TO = 5
School System 8	Poor Economy/Commuting Distance from Military Base and Small City/ Very Rural/2 Other Districts in County	1,250 S (86% White) 80 T (75% White)	I = 12: A = 2 T = 5 FT = 5 TO = 5
School System 9	Improving Economy/ Commuting Distance Metro Area/Fastest Growing District in 4-District County	1,500 S (87% White) 100 T (89% White)	I = 25: A = 2 T = 17 FT = 6 TO = 6
School System 10	Poor Economy/Little Industry/Very Low Per Capita/Single-County District	3,300 S (75% Black) 180 T (53% Black)	I = 18: A = 1 T = 5 FT = 12 TO = 23
School System 11	Stable Economy/ County System Separate from City System with Primarily Black Student Population	4,300 S (50% Black) 260 T (70% White)	I = 19: A = 2 T = 5 FT = 12 TO = 15

A = School System Administrator
T = Teachers
FT = Former Teachers Interviewed
TO = Turnover

A Synthesis of Qualitative Research

These case studies sought to address the question, "What are the situational variables impacting upon the supply and demand of teachers in the Southeast?" From Study I (Berry, 1984), it was found that a number of variables were not being considered in the present reform movement to remedy the problems of the teacher labor market. These variables included urban and rural contextual differences, low turnover rates, family-driven mobility patterns, and the impact of working conditions on the teacher work force.

While numerous individuals involved in educational organizations were utilized as respondents in that initial study, one potential response group--teachers who had left their teaching positions--was missing. In fact, this category has received very little attention in recent survey research regarding the problems of the teacher labor market. Subsequently, Studies II and III were undertaken to validate or, in fact, dispel particular findings from the initial study and to better understand the specific conditions and circumstances surrounding teacher turnover in different sites. The data from Studies II and III did validate the initial study's findings regarding the impact of family mobility, student discipline problems, lack of administrative support, and limited career alternatives to the teacher labor market. However, these studies described factors that were impacting upon those who were presently (or recently had been) in teaching, such as common attitudes and values held by those from particular backgrounds, a desire to serve public school-age children, and, in some cases, the ability to meet the needs of their own families. Subsequently, it was queried that while the current policy reform movement would have

little positive impact on the present labor pool, it might have a significant effect on those who had chosen not to teach--i.e., noneducation college seniors. This research question undergirded Study IV (Berry, 1985b). Study IV found that negative perceptions of teaching emerged from these students' (1) particular family backgrounds, (2) subject matter orientations, and (3) organizational and social disincentives in their public school experience that influenced them not to become teachers.

Further data collection and analysis of teacher turnover were undertaken in Study V, representing diverse rural settings. Study V validated the previous findings regarding teacher mobility and raised further questions--including those focusing on how the impact of political and economic decisions made on state and local levels (in differing contexts) inhibit and facilitate the process of attracting and retaining quality teachers.

These five studies begin to delineate from an insider's perspective not only the unique local conditions that are impacting upon the teacher labor market in the Southeast, but also a broad range of situational variables that are generally not accounted for in most policy reforms. These conditions and variables are discussed under the following areas: (1) career choice and expectations, (2) recruitment and selection, (3) mobility and attrition, (4) working conditions, and (5) organizational disincentives for teaching. These processes are dramatically shaping the teacher labor market in the region and, in many cases, challenge the efficacy of such policy reforms as career ladders and merit pay in attracting and retaining quality teachers in teaching. The assumptions implicit in such policies as career ladders and merit pay plans are that the best teachers do not enter teaching (or that they exit the occupation

early) because of the lack of career opportunity and monetary gain. As the results of these case studies are presented, consider the assumptions that are implicit within these policies and how the contextual understandings derived from qualitative research can significantly inform policy making.

Career Choice and Expectations

Most teachers were influenced to become teachers by their own public school teachers and, consequently, tended to display the same fervor toward working with children (or adolescents) as their own teachers. In some cases, it was the mere fact that "Mama was a teacher." Most often, their career choices were made because of their own positive public school experiences and reflected the notion of teaching as a "calling"--sometimes akin to a religious one. It seemed that many teachers "embraced [their] profession with the singleness of purpose" that was characteristic of "Miss Dove" and her lifelong commitment to quality teaching (Patton, 1954, p. 22).

For those teachers and education students who came from rural areas with "no industry" or "no shopping centers," teaching provided them with a "very good" income, the opportunity to stay close to home and their extended family, and, in most cases, a significant "step up" the economic and social ladder of their communities. In fact, the linkage between school and community in rural areas facilitated increased parental involvement, fewer (and less intense) student discipline problems, and "overwhelming job satisfaction" among teachers. Consequently, rural schools became a part of the teachers' "extended family"--providing job security and the opportunity to utilize their nurturing personalities in working with children or adolescents. Given that rural school administrators were more likely to "let

[their] teachers teach," it was not surprising that these teachers expected just to teach--period.

For those teachers and education students who came from urban areas and had "spouses with good jobs," teaching provided a good secondary income and time for vacation and to be with their children while still "working in an environment that caters to kids." Very few of these teachers tended to perceive of themselves as having other career alternatives. For most, industry was considered "too impersonal." In some cases, this was manifested by teachers who left teaching to "fulfill [their] fantasy of being a chemist in the white lab coat." However, they returned to the classroom, since industry positions were found to be "dirty, dirty work" and did not provide the opportunity to develop "close relationships" among colleagues.

One could determine what (and at what grade level) education students and teachers would teach by identifying when they became interested in teaching as public school students. (Many taught the subject, and at the exact grade level, by which they were most influenced as students.) A second grade teacher related stories about her second grade teacher, a chemistry teacher spoke of the close interaction with her high school science teacher in the lab, and a social studies teacher (and coach) reflected upon the impact of the "fatherly" relationship he had with his high school coach. This pattern was similar for most of the education students and teachers and emphasized the considerable significance of role modeling in the path to teaching.

The career choices of bright noneducation college students emerged from their motivations, personal experiences, perceptions of their major (subject) area, and their own interpersonal and communication skills. From these factors, characteristics emerged among many of these students that

ran counter to the ethos of teaching and the individual characteristics associated with teachers.

Bright students sought "challenging" jobs and defined success in terms of "understanding their fields better" and "continuing to learn in a stimulating environment." Like their counterparts in education, these students were quite altruistic; many sought to make "contributions to mankind" in their careers and expressed interest in "helping people who wanted to be helped." Unfortunately, many believed that today's public schools were "boring" places with students who were uninterested in learning what they would like to teach. In addition, early life experiences and parental influences molded their perceptions of themselves as doctors, researchers, engineers, or business executives. The career expectations of urban students tended to reflect those of their parents, but those of rural students tended to be the antithesis of rural lifestyles and values.

Talented noneducation college students were heavily influenced by their "best" public school teachers who "instilled a deep desire" in them to pursue intellectual and professional goals. These teachers tended to be some of these students' "best friends" in high school. Nonetheless, public school teaching was actively discouraged by teachers, parents, and the community.

Most high-achieving students in math and the sciences primarily chose their fields because of their "intrinsic order." They were interested in "pure and logical" and "tangible" subject matter and, in turn, saw the social sciences as "relativistic," "intangible," and ultimately "boring." The fact that teachers "must be able to perform their work in a setting in which unpredictable and nonroutine events constantly intrude upon the order they have labored to create" (Sykes and Devaney, 1985, p. 245) mitigated

the possibility of these students' considering teaching as a career alternative.

Many bright students who were "intrigued and motivated to discover something important" did not consider themselves as sellers. These students were "not comfortable in front of people," and many would "rather be stuck away in a lab." On the other hand, those who thought they could "explain things well" would rather do so only to a "team of chemists" since they came from "very specialized" and "common backgrounds." Others recognized that to be an effective public school teacher, one must "have a great deal of patience," like to work with children or adolescents, and "be a seller--meeting [students] halfway." It was readily recognized that teaching could not be a career alternative solely because they did not have the "temperament."

Recruitment and Selection

The recruitment and selection processes involved in both university education departments and school systems had similar characteristics--they were limited, inactive, somewhat bureaucratic, somewhat informal, and generally diffuse. University education officials reported that they "essentially do nothing" to recruit students to their programs and to the public schools. Some university officials noted that they rely on their reputations as research institutions or former teachers' colleges.

Although most education departments "take those that come to them," one, a former women's teacher's college, had developed fairly aggressive recruitment procedures by establishing "good rapport with high school guidance counselors," sending out "individual brochures," and "making contacts" with high school seniors who have been identified as having some

interest in education. More often, the colleges and universities relied on "the number of alumni that sent their children back to their school." However, this was not necessarily the case at traditionally black universities where "there is more opportunity for minority students than ever before." Interestingly, students in the education departments at these universities tended to score higher on the SAT than their counterparts in other departments. However, one placement officer noted that although students in chemistry might score lower on the SAT, "industry is real interested in qualified minority candidates . . . [and will] come in and hire a chemistry major and then send them to school in chemical engineering." Furthermore, attracting education students at this university "has reached a very critical stage," since many students will not be able to attain the NTE cut-off score for entry into the program.

Although most school systems had a plethora of applicants on file, officials in urban systems tended to "assume the right people will walk in the door . . . as people are leaving, people are coming." In these areas, there were "built-in supplies," because "industry and universities attract able spouses," and many experienced "applicants who are 30-38 years old" and whose children are grown were returning to the classroom. As one urban official noted, "In many cases, the divorce has necessitated [these teachers'] going back to work." Subsequently, these urban system administrators only needed "to recruit people in areas where there is not enough depth of the pool." As another urban official stated, "We may hire 30 to 40 math and science [per year], and our reservoir is 50." It appeared that many school systems had been lulled into inactive recruiting by the large numbers of applicants available. Table F exhibits the approximate annual number of teacher applications on file by each of the school systems under

TABLE F

SCHOOL SYSTEM APPLICANTS ON FILE

SCHOOL SYSTEM	NUMBER OF TEACHERS EMPLOYED	NUMBER OF APPLICANTS
1	2,000	1,000
2	4,000	3,500
3	275	100
4	320	100
5	1,300	600
6	270	300
7	40	60
8	80	60
9	100	80
10	180	100
11	260	125

study. Given that the size of these applicant pools had remained constant for some time, it was not surprising that school systems were less than proactive in their approach to recruiting potential teachers. However, for some school systems, most notably the larger ones, the personnel offices would tend to be aloof in their recruiter-candidate relationships. Teachers frequently stated that system personnel "treated them as if they were doing [the teachers] a favor" by even considering them for a position. Other teachers "dreaded" going to the personnel office where "secretaries usually snubbed" them and "discouraged question-asking."

While urban school systems and those near universities utilized their built-in supply, rural systems tended to rely on those who "want to come

home and teach" in their rural settings. Given that many rural school systems were more segregated, administrators utilized this situation in attracting and retaining particular candidate pools. As one administrator noted, "We are [a] white school system, and this is important to many young white female teachers." This situation created a two-edged sword, since administrators would like to recruit black candidates to become role models for their few black students. However, in their communities, there was "absolutely no place for a black teacher with a middle-class income to live."

Rural administrators typically "foresaw no problem" in recruiting teacher candidates in the future, since they "could always ask teachers from surrounding areas," the "community really sells the good reputation of the school," they "could always rearrange course loads," and they could rely on their informal networks. This reliance on informal networks emerged primarily from a simply stated administrator belief: "The informal way is the way to find good teachers . . . the formal way is the way to get what's left over." The utilization of informal networks was epitomized by one rural principal in relating "a story" of how he replaced a "high-demand" teacher (a high school chemistry teacher who "retired" after 20 years and went to work at the only nearby industry--the local water treatment plant):

> I looked at several applicants, and I wasn't satisfied . . . but then I found a lady from New York . . . . She moved into the area with her husband . . . he was originally from here and wanted to farm again . . . . My guidance counselor met her at church and told me about her.

In fact, the identification of potential teachers in rural areas is enhanced by its most notable cause of turnover--retirement--because "when somebody retires, everybody hears about it around here."

Nonetheless, rural systems are faced with some recruitment concerns. As one rural administrator noted, "sometimes it is a real dogfight to get teachers." Rural systems often have to compete against a myriad of small, neighboring school districts within the same county, wait on state and local budget allocations that are not finalized until midsummer, and lose top candidates (especially minority) to metro school systems with more local money and positions. With regard to the latter, rural school systems could not and, in some cases, would not compete with nearby metro school systems. First, rural systems could not "court and sign outstanding people" early in the "recruiting season" and later place them in the most appropriate vacancy, since they do not have flexible local money. On the other hand, rural systems "would not hire a Ph.D. in chemistry," since "he would have to earn too much money." Other inhibitors of the recruitment process were: few resources to impact a key attractor for a potential teacher's consideration, supplies and materials for the classroom; inability to pay higher local teacher pay supplements; and, often, the inability to attract the spouses of industrial managers as a continual supply of teachers because the community lacked an industrial base.

Although teacher selection was generally characterized as "who knows who," larger school systems that had more centralized hiring processes more often inhibited the principals' role in personnel decisions. Bureaucratic procedures, emanating from the central office, would limit the potential pool of candidates for building principals. Although all system administrators noted similar constraints in the selection process--enrollment fluctuation and state/county budget decisions--larger systems noted "internal transfer policies." For these systems, administrators "must first look at [those] already employed" before hiring a new teacher. In

fact, one urban administrator noted:

> The internal transfer [policies] are a big problem . . . . Teachers are constantly moving . . . . We miss a lot of folks because of that . . . . Because of all these internal policies we can court and sign outstanding people, but we cannot court and sign average people.

Subsequently, many principals don't have the opportunity to see many new candidates. Although some principals "look at those already employed . . . and still get no takers," others lamented that they get to "look only at the top five candidates." Although "over 90 percent" of all applicants are interviewed by the central office in a large metropolitan system, principals "talked to very few." As one principal in that system asserted:

> A lady recently called me from New York . . . . She and her husband were moving to the area and heard about [my school] . . . . I couldn't do a thing--I can be courteous . . . . I can be pushed for her, but I look at it as a lesson in futility. I'd rather spend my time with kids.

Hiring was a year-round process for central office administrators in this metropolitan system. With internal transfers, spouse moves, and the interviewing of "everybody who applies," the personnel office "keeps moving" so that they can solve immediate problems on a short-term basis. In fact, one central office administrator, in comparing his work to the informal processes in smaller school systems, claimed, "Ours is like an employment agency, and theirs is like an executive search."

Larger urban systems had policies that facilitated the selection of teachers. For example, selection policies included the requirement that an applicant with any system teaching experience is to have "hiring priority" over others. Essentially, this policy tended to encourage people to work as aides and substitutes so that they could "get their foot in the door." While some used this proactive approach in their job search, others "just

applied and waited." One elementary teacher stated that she was "surprised that [she] was hired since there were supposed to be 200-300 applicants for every vacancy." From the teachers' perspective, how well they met the job description (e.g., extracurricular responsibilities as well as the subject area teaching assignment) and the central office interview tended to be the most salient factors in their selection. Some were "hired without ever talking to the [building] principal."

Although the above descriptions of selection processes fit those of large urban school systems and not the informal, decentralized processes in rural systems and schools, there were some striking similiarities. If a candidate met the certification and extracurricular requirements for a particular position, there was consensus regarding what characteristics that person ought to possess in order to teach. School system officials were not necessarily interested in prospective teachers with "the best academic qualities." They desired those with "a certain amount of intelligence," but more importantly, teachers needed to be able to "relate to children and parents," "organize," "discipline," "withstand pressure," and be involved in extracurricular activities. In many cases, those who were "very bright" were not what systems officials needed or wanted. An urban principal noted that some of these "best" teachers had "turned out to be terrible as [they] don't expect enough . . . just can't handle people." Rural administrators sought nonacademic characteristics in teachers for other reasons. One asserted:

> There is a helluva difference between teaching physics and chemistry at the high school level and at the college level . . . . I wouldn't want a Ph.D. from DuPont . . . . We don't have the space [or community desire] for the added challenge.

Another rural superintendent noted that in order to teach in his system:

> You have to love the church . . . not like life in the fast lane . . . have a real appreciation [for those who are] poor and illiterate . . . . Talk about teaching the whole child--our teachers really have to do it.

Having "that energy level" and "being able to think of and understand [students] as individuals" were important selection criteria. However, in high schools that had "20 different sports and an 80-member marching band," it was not surprising that administrators and principals "are looking for people who can do more than teach." Therefore, it is not surprising that officials fill science positions "with a PE teacher--[because] most of them are certified in biology or physical sciences, too." For some, good coaches were "real hard to find." One social studies education student noted:

> I told him [system interviewer] about football . . . . Without asking a question, [he wrote down] "excellent applicant" . . . . He then told me, "If I have an opening, I'll call you--if I don't, I'll make one."

But, one "story" was even more illuminating regarding school systems' concern for coaches. A former physics teacher noted his reason for leaving: "I was dissatisfied with working as a coach and in [this school system] if you give up your coaching, they terminated your contract."

Mobility and Attrition

Recruiting by even the more urban school systems was rather limited. (The largest system spent $2,500 on recruiting in 1983-84.) Resources were generally expended to travel to a "few campuses." Even then, these systems did not travel far--as they recognized the "immobility" of education students. Urban students wanted to teach "back home," in their university town, or in a place like their university town. Rural students were even less mobile as they wanted "to teach only back home . . . sometimes working

as an aide or substitute teacher" until a job opens. However, some rural students who attended urban universities did not want to return home because there were not many job openings. But, more importantly, they recognized that their "philosophy doesn't click" in rural areas any more, and there were "things to do" in their university town. This was not surprising since many rural students of high quality (who choose to become doctors or lawyers) leave their home towns, attend urban universities, and also "never return." One rural teacher characterized the "impossible" task of attracting and retaining urban students to become teachers in their systems by exclaiming: "What's a young person to do here on Saturday night?"

The limited mobility patterns of education students were compounded by teacher mobility preferences that were demarcated by the needs of the nuclear family for those in urban areas and the needs of the extended family for those in rural areas. While the teacher turnover rates for the school years 1983-84 (for School Systems 1-6) and 1984-85 (for School Systems 7-11) ranged considerably (from 2.0 to 12.5 percent), there were consistent, albeit differing, patterns for urban and rural attrition. Many teachers left their positions primarily because of "spouse moves" and child rearing. (One teacher moved with her husband 6 times in 10 years.) Although this was primarily a pattern found in urban school systems, it also was an emerging one in rural school systems that were within commuting distance of industrial sites. Dissatisfactions with teaching were more prevalent in inner-city school systems. While many rural teachers stayed in their positions because "Daddy lives right down the road" and some "couldn't afford to stay home" with their children, others left when a teaching position "opened up back home." On the other hand, "urban"

teachers teaching in "nearby" systems (defined as being no more than a one-hour commuter drive) left when a position "opened up" in the city system in which they lived. Although retirements accounted for considerable urban and rural turnover, some teachers left because there was no nearby university at which to pursue a graduate degree. Table G highlights teacher turnover rates in the 11 school systems and the reasons given by teachers for their resignations. Table H shows where the teachers went.

While a number of teachers left because of dissatisfactions with teaching, the data describes other factors that were significantly involved in the reasons why teachers leave teaching. The data suggests that teacher turnover does not necessarily equate with teacher attrition from teaching. For example, of the teachers who had left the largest school system in the sample (#2), 69 percent were either teaching (in other systems), at home, or retired. In the other large school system (#1), 58 percent (excluding retirees) were either teaching elsewhere or at home with their families. In most cases, those at home plan to return to the classroom at some time in the near future when they "feel comfortable" leaving their children in a day-care situation. Other school systems revealed similar data. In addition, other teachers who left for <u>other occupations</u> were in sales (real estate or insurance), self-employed (primarily with their spouses or parents), conducting training for industry (primarily with banks), or bookkeeping. This pattern held for math and science teachers as well. Of all teachers interviewed or tracked, only two left to enter high-tech industry (both utility companies)--and returned to the classroom after discovering that "the grass is not always greener on the other side." Others left teaching to pursue other administrative jobs in education. A few, especially females, left for personnel positions in industry after

TABLE G

TEACHER ATTRITION: PERCENT OF RESIGNEE SAMPLE BY REASON

SCHOOL SYSTEM	YEAR	APPROX. NO. OF TEACHERS EMPLOYED	RESIGNA-TIONS	APPROX. TURNOVER RATE	RESPONSE[1] RATE	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY REASON FOR LEAVING TEACHING						
						RETIRE.	SPOUSE MOVE	FAMILY	CLOSER HOME	DISSAT.	OTHER JOB EDUC.	OTHER[2]
1	1983-84	2,000	145	7%	41%	**	29	16	6	33	16	-
2	1983-84	4,000	210	5.3%	60%	24	20	15	4	21	4	12
3	1983-84	275	6	2.2%	100%*	50	-	-	-	-	17	33
4	1983-84	320	11	3.4%	100%*	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	1983-84	1,300	27	2.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	1983-84	270	10	3.7%	100%*	50	10	20	-	-	-	20
7	1984-85	40	5	12.5%	100%	-	60	20	20	-	-	-
8	1984-85	80	5	6.25%	100%	-	20	-	40	20	-	20
9	1984-85	100	6	6.0%	100%	-	33	16	33	-	-	16
10	1984-85	180	22	12.2%	100%*	27	18	4	32	4	4	11
11	1984-85	260	15	5.7%	100%	13	27	13	13	13	10	11

[1]If marked by *, response rate includes administrator designation of reason for turnover.

[2]This category includes: Business Opportunities, "Breaks from Education," Reduction-in-Force, Coaching Changes, Returning to Graduate School, Personal Problems, and Certification Problems.

**Sixteen percent of the total 1983-84 resignations were retirements--these were not part of sample.

TABLE H

WHERE TEACHERS WENT: PERCENT OF RESIGNEE SAMPLE BY PRESENT OCCUPATION

SCHOOL SYSTEM	YEAR	RESPONSE RATE	RETIRE[1]	TEACHING ELSE-WHERE	HOME	SALES	SELF-EMPLOYED	TRAINER BOOK-KEEPER	SCHOOL ADMIN.	BUSINESS	GRAD. SCHOOL	OTHER[2]
1	83-4	41%	N/A*	34	24	12	-	-	16	3	3	8
2	83-4	60%	18	26	25	9	7	5	3	2	4	1
3	83-4	100%	50	-	-	-	-	-	33	-	17	-
4	83-4	100%	80	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	83-4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	83-4	100%	50	40	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-
7	84-5	100%	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	84-5	100%	-	80	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-
9	84-5	100%	-	83	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	84-5	100%	27	50	5	-	-	-	8	-	-	10
11	84-5	100%	13	40	13	7	-	-	-	7	-	20

*Information not available.

[1]Retired and not working.

[2]Includes working as a writer, as a graphics designer, in the military, for the FBI, as a postal clerk, in church work, as a librarian, or unemployed.

"continually being turned down" for administrative posts within their districts. In some cases, those who left teaching for industry were more likely to be considered "capable" and "better-than-average" teachers by their school administrators. However, these teachers didn't demonstrate the "outward concern for students as most of [the district's] dedicated teachers did."

The data indicate that those relatively few teachers who leave teaching and the fewer teachers who leave because of dissatisfactions were not doing so primarily because of low salaries and the lack of career advancement within teaching. This pattern held for those teachers who are assumed to have more varied and lucrative opportunities (i.e., high school math and science teachers). However, "high-demand" teachers appeared to be more likely to leave because of dissatisfactions (Berry, 1985). These dissatisfactions seemed to be associated with the working conditions inherent in school organization and environment. Discussion of these findings is presented in the next sections.

Working Conditions

Generally, if teachers left because of dissatisfactions, it was because they "couldn't handle disadvantaged kids" (an inner-city high school principal), or they were "frustrated with the lack of disciplinary action taken by administrators" (a resigning inner-city calculus teacher from the same school). The frustrations of these teachers emerged more from the perception that schools were "demanding" and "stressful" places to work, not that they were vastly underpaid or did not have opportunities for career growth. Many of their frustrations were rooted in the fact that they had:

> on planning period . . . had to teach in a broom closet . . . too many responsibilities . . . inadequate supplies . . . too much after-school work . . . paperwork, paperwork, and more paperwork.

As one English teacher in a large, urban high school who was forced to retire because of her "nerves," asserted, "I know I could have taught better if I didn't have to raise $8,000 for the Junior-Senior prom."

However, most of their frustrations emerged from deeply rooted problems with administrators, parents, and students. For a relatively young inner-city calculus teacher, it was the realization that she

> . . . just didn't like it anymore . . . . It's student attitude and discipline . . . . I thought kids wanted to learn . . . . It's their language, their behavior, the way they talk . . . . They don't have any respect . . . . In my last two classes, we were all hot and tired [there was no air conditioning in her room] . . . I can't teach them anything . . . they won't be quiet and they won't listen . . . . When I send in discipline referrals it takes 3-4 days before something is done.

For a former high school math teacher (who is at home with her child, but plans to teach again), her resignation arose primarily because of a pregnancy, but also because

> [her] school was very low academically with no help or expectations from parents. Students were unruly and uncooperative while we had a drill-sergeant administration . . . . It was hard to do a good job under conditions in which you were fighting at every corner to maintain peace and harmony.

However, not all teachers will return. For a former middle school science teacher (who was working as a technical writer with her mother in a software development company), her resignation was primarily because of "poor support from an incompetent administration regarding student discipline . . . . Students would threaten teachers and would be allowed to return to class only to do it again." In fact, the characterization of her work life at school consisted of "lack of student respect [for

teachers] . . . poor response of students to their subject areas . . . poor support from parents . . . administrative chores . . . and too many social-related problems of students that required her attention." Many of these characterizations were manifested by students' constantly "talking back" to her, her "working harder on homework than her students," students' "destroying lab equipment," parents "not controlling their kids," and having to deal with students' social problems for which she "wasn't trained." Furthermore, those "trained" to assist teachers with these problems--i.e., psychologists--were "rarely" available to work with the "extreme problem" students. Consequently, she entered a "peaceful" work environment that consisted of the opportunities to be "praised for work well-done," provided "incentives" for working overtime, and associated with "professionally oriented" staff members and managers. Other teachers left to work in environments where they were not "slaves" to children or adolescents--accounting for their "every movement both in and outside of classrooms." Former teachers presently in other occupations appreciated the "opportunity to now have lunch in a restaurant."

Since many teachers left because of the "valuing of mediocrity" (in their schools and systems) and "burnout due to the lack of rewards or pats on the back," they sought new careers (or sometimes other schools) where the "valuing of success" was the predominant ethos, and administrative recognition of their individual value was prevalent. In some cases, teachers "took cuts in pay" to obtain these working conditions. As a former junior high math teacher (metro area school) who entered sales reported: "It was not the money . . . . The reason goes much, much deeper . . . . If the school system appreciated the job I did, I would go back."

For many teachers, student discipline was an immense problem because

"teachers and administrators are afraid of kids," and one "has to be an attorney" to discipline a student. As one former teacher noted, "It is not just educators and politicians . . . but parents . . . . The second television is more important than a tutor." Similarly, for others, it was the fact that "there is more pressure from parents . . . [they] are ready to jump on you and tear you to pieces." As one first grade teacher with 30 years' teaching experience claimed, "You have to be so careful . . . . The child will say 'my mama will sue' . . . . We let parents win." Teachers sought explanations for these problematic conditions. One elementary school teacher who taught in an "ideal school" noted that "kids are not as bubbly about education [as they once were] . . . . It used to be: 'I want to be doctor"--now it's Michael Jackson or Boy George." A high school chemistry teacher (24 years experience) explained further:

> I have a different kind of student . . . . It used to be that schools were the center of the community . . . now, the malls . . . . Most all of them [students] drive . . . . We used to have home visitation--now no one is home.

A young middle school teacher asserted:

> After awhile you feel you are fighting a losing battle . . . . Kids are wilder . . . they are not as interested in hard core academics . . . . You've got to play schemes [to motivate them] . . . . You spend most of your time trying to get them serious . . . . Maybe society in general has changed.

Although these conditions and circumstances under which teachers taught were evident across all sites, there was the tendency for teachers in rural systems to have fewer concerns regarding poor student discipline, incompetent and uncaring administration, and uncooperative parents. In these systems, administrators were more likely to "run off bad students" with "explicit" discipline policies and "make sure [their] good teachers were appreciated." With very few resources to provide for other job

benefits, these administrators worked at "providing a structure so teachers can teach." In some cases, administrators "wore 50 different hats" so teachers would be relieved of "bureaucratic paperwork." Furthermore, administrators were less likely to be demanding, more likely to share information with teachers and parents, and "defend teachers to the public." In addition, teachers were allowed to do pretty much what they wanted. But, most importantly, for many teachers who left urban systems to teach in these rural ones, "the people [in rural school systems] are friendly, not backstabbing," and the community is described in terms of its "close-kint, family atmosphere." Teachers also generally had a higher standing in the community.

However, small rural school systems were not without their organizational problems--many of which worked against their ability to provide an attractive work environment for teachers. First, although their class size was generally smaller than that of their counterparts in urban schools, rural teachers usually had four or five preparations. These teachers were "overworked" since administrators and the community "expected way too much" of them. The best science teachers taught labs for their students as well as the labs of other science teachers who were not as qualified. Furthermore, the science labs were "insufficient," since many were 25-30 years old and improper for numerous experiments that new teachers would like to teach their students. In other cases, if small rural schools were to promote "acadmic excellence," then advanced courses would have to be "taught at night" since the "daytime schedule had always been overloaded." The very best teachers in these systems were expected to teach enrichment courses (including SAT preparation) at night, on weekends, and during the summer. Some of these "best" teachers were quite willing to "put in all those extra

hours" since they felt close to their communities and had great pride in their school and its academic accomplishments. For the most part, these teachers were originally from the community, had "married a local fellow," and their "family still farmed" in the area. However, for those teachers from the "outside," the close school-community linkages created a problematic working condition for them: the close scrutinization of one's social life by local townspeople. This condition was especially difficult for young, relatively urban teachers who had chosen to teach in rural systems because of their favorable conditions. These "outsiders" were "not trusted" by the locals and consequently would "have stories made up" about them. Furthermore, as one administrator noted, "rural life is not one that attracts bright people . . . . Bright young people want something better."

Nonetheless, conditions existed that attract teachers to teaching, to their systems, and to their schools. Although teaching school could be "frustrating," it was "never the same." Schools were attractive compared to the "boring" perception of working in an office, a business, or industry. In schools, they gained a "sense of pride" in "knowing that they are molding the minds" of children or adolescents. Not only was the "human element . . . helping people" aspect of teaching a salient attractor, but more so, the opportunity to "help young people." For others, the hours ("I can teach and still be a housewife and mother") and the stability ("it's steady income") of the job were important enough to remain in teaching. In addition, in counties where there were "no more than 30 government jobs that pay more than $15,000 a year," teaching salaries provided "very good income." Consider the reasons why teachers stay in teaching:

> It gives me time to vacation and have time with my children (teacher, rural school system).

> I'll do this until I retire . . . . Just give me the money . . . . Most of us feel this way [since] very few of us want to move up . . . . Most of us were raised here . . . . We do not want to move away or travel . . . . We do not have much initiative (rural high school teacher).
>
> Some are capable of higher paying jobs, but they love it . . . . Their husbands are in the area . . . . Many are farmers, and this is as good a job as you can find around here . . . . For others, this is as good as they can do (rural high school principal).
>
> They don't have anything else to do . . . . They enjoy teaching . . . . Their spouses are employed here (urban high school principal).
>
> I want to help people and my state (rural high school teacher).
>
> People who want to teach--teach . . . . It is not a money thing . . . . Teaching is not like a job (high school principal, suburban system).

Some do feel frustrated and trapped, as one urban system teacher asserted:

> I don't want to leave education, even though I don't like the lack of independence . You know, teaching--that's what I'm good at . . . . Honestly, the money has kept me from going elsewhere . . . . Many teachers have invested years . . . you're comfortable. They complain in the teacher's lounge, but their convictions are not that strong . . . . You see, you've got a house and a mortgage . . . you can't leave--practically.

Subsequently, more often than not, "nothing on the outside could attract [teachers] away from teaching--you would have to drive" them out.

Organizational Disincentives for Teaching

Although these studies have pointed to the fact that teaching has probably attracted and retained more than its fair share of qualified teachers (compared to other occupations), they also have indicated that a number of countervailing factors were at work in creating organizational disincentives for talented people to consider teaching. (Most of these

factors were uncovered through discussions with (1) teachers and how they were viewed by and related to their students and (2) noneducation college students and how their career expectations developed vis-a-vis their perceptions of teaching. Generally, potential teachers, as students in the public schools, were able to discover and critique the career of teaching through the experiences of their teachers, as well as through their own. In fact, students reacted to powerful perceptions emerging from the organizational character of the school--a character that developed out of the (1) teachers' responsibilities and requirements, (2) teachers' authority and control, (3) prevalence of negative role modeling for teaching, (4) day-to-day pedagogy of teachers and professors, (5) changing social nature of schools, and (6) academic, and thus, social segregation within the public schools.

The experiences, motivations, and interpersonal and communication skills prevented many students from considering teaching as a career alternative. However, other students who tended to be somewhat altruistic in their career goals indicated they could teach since they perceived teaching as a "fun" and "important" endeavor. These students were more likely to have had teachers who were their "best friends" while in high school and "instilled" in them a "deep desire" to pursue their subject area. In addition, many of these students noted that they would teach for less money than they would earn otherwise in their chosen fields in industry. However, certain conditions of the occupation, of which they were familiar, must be changed--conditions related directly to teachers' responsibilities and requirements:

1. They would teach only the advanced classes in their field, since this was where they had evidenced motivated students. In fact, many would refuse to "deal with wild students" and would want to "separate the clowns from the others."

2. They would not want to be responsible for such extra-curricular "chores" as homerooms, paperwork, and coaching assignments.

3. They would not want to act as surrogate parents or guardians for students in nonclassroom situations. This was exemplified by those who would not want to "spend their time" during midday "monitor[ing] 200 kids in a lunchroom."

4. They perceived teaching as a "24-hour job" which ran counter to their expectation of "not having to take their work home" with them.

5. Since many would want to teach only for a few years (as a "reprieve" from college before entering graduate school), they would not want to go through the "hassle" of teacher certification programs and "Mickey Mouse" education courses.

Although these conditions would have to be met for a wide range of students to consider teaching, high-achieving students were more likely to be "turned off" from teaching by the lack of teacher control and by bureaucratic intrusion by the school system. While a 4.0 GPA engineering student would "need the flexibility to teach students what [he] wanted them to learn," a 4.0 GPA business student would "require that incompetent principals not impose guidelines and get in [her] way of doing new things." In addition, a 3.4 GPA biology major, who aspired to genetic research or pediatrics, claimed explicitly:

> It would be neat [to teach], but, I probably couldn't do it since I don't have the calling [like others who enter teaching]. I'm directed toward medicine . . . . Therefore, money doesn't make a difference [to me] . . . . I guess the big thing that makes it unattractive is the lack of [teacher] control.

Brighter students, with a more sophisticated understanding of school organizations, were more likely to be pushed away from teaching by the subtle, yet significant constraints placed upon teachers.

In addition to these factors, students lived through "horror stories" regarding discipline problems and low pay in high school and were retold about them when in college. In general, students have been the recipients

of negative role modeling by the media and those in education. Some students could not perceive of themselves as teachers. By the "way it was brought out" to them by the media, teaching was a "poor person's occupation." In addition, math professors in college ask their students, "Why would you go into education? You are smart!" However, the most significant perpetuators of negative role modeling were teachers themselves. Teacher dissatisfactions regarding societal changes and administrators', parents', and students' attitudes and behaviors manifested themselves in such a way that teachers commonly "now recruit [their] students away from teaching." A bright biology major, who dropped out of the college's education program and planned to enter dental school, recalled: "When I did my student teaching, I was told by my cooperating teacher, 'Why are you going into teaching--you can do better. We have to teach; you don't.'" However, even if teachers were neutral role models for their occupation, students would develop insights about teaching that couldn't otherwise be developed for other alternatives. As a rural high school math teacher, in discussing the career possibilities for her 12 precalculus students, asserted:

> They see teaching as a very difficult job--the amount of work involved and the time spent. They really know the amount of work involved in teaching. They've seen 12 years of the public schools and not 12 years of accounting or civil engineering. You see, the word "engineer" sounds good to them.

Still, it became apparent that even more powerful factors prevailed that mitigated the possibility of talented individuals' considering teaching--even as a short-term career alternative.

First, the day-to-day pedagogy of their teachers and professors had a significant impact upon college students' decisions not to teach. Many of them perceived that they would get "bored" with the occupation of teaching

since they were "bored as [public school] students." Many viewed high school teaching as "doing the same thing over and over" as a consequence of being taught by teachers whose lessons plans "never changed." In addition, the prevalence of routine teaching impacted upon these students in another way: they were taught that teaching in the public schools preempted creative and individualistic approaches to dealing with work-related tasks and problems. A biology major, who intended to become a respiratory therapist, claimed:

> As a teacher you do the same thing over and over . . . . You say, "Class, today we will learn about snails," and you do the same thing next year . . . . As a respiratory therapist you have different cases . . . do different things . . . . It would be exciting.

Bright students, who saw teaching as a "fun" and "important" endeavor, were more likely to describe their "best teachers" in terms of their interactive approaches to teaching both inside and outside of the classroom. On the other hand, students who did not see teaching as an exciting endeavor were more likely to describe their teachers in terms of their lectures and routine assignments. This impact of pedagogy on the perceptions of teaching have been illuminated recently by Frank Newman (1985) in his assessment of higher education:

> A student cannot learn to reason solely by listening to a description of how a teacher or professor has reasoned. Lectures, at their best, transmit knowledge, but they are rarely inspiring. They seldom transform the experience of learning from the humdrum to a level of excitement that captures the student's attention. Students know that mastering data or a given professor's viewpoint is only peripherally related to the purposes of education, but intimately related to the grades necessary for admission to selective programs. So the process breeds cynicism toward teaching [emphasis added] (p. 24).

However, the impact of pedagogy had an even more subtle effect. Some students would be bored by teaching because they had been taught their

subject matter in such a way that it would have to be "taught down" to high school students. A chemistry major, who intended to work on research projects, noted that "many teachers don't know how to bring it down to your level . . . . I've learned so much I couldn't go teach what I learned in the first year" of undergraduate school. An engineering student, who intended to work in the space program, asserted:

> To tell you the truth, up until high school, I wanted to be a teacher . . . . I remember being bored in my Algebra II class . . . . I would need to teach more than Calculus I or Physics I.

A physics major, who had just entered graduate school, noted similar concerns:

> I was going to teach high school, but I thought about the discipline problems in the schools. You might not have many discipline problems in physics, but I know I'd be stuck with some basic classes . . . . Even if I taught for a while, it wouldn't be for a career . . . . It would be frustrating to teach at level--if you teach high school physics, all you know is high school physics.

In large measure, these bright students could not envision themselves as "breaking down" advanced facts learned in the latter stages of their undergraduate study for high school students. Perhaps these college students had been taught in such a manner that they did not appreciate and embrace a full conceptual understanding of their subject matter.

Another factor prevailed: the changing social nature of the public schools. Some students never participated fully in public school life and, subsequently, did not positively identify strongly with either their schools or their teachers. In large measure, this situation occurred in large urban schools where extracurricular activities were quite fragmented and segregated, and community involvement was less focused. In these cases, some students were "social outcasts," and, thus, they could not

envision themselves as ever returning to a public school, much less becoming teachers. Although this factor emerged from the internal character of the extracurricular life at the school, there was a significant external factor that affected students' perceptions regarding the possibility of their becoming teachers. This external factor was shaped by the common pattern of many students' "always working" part-time and, in some cases, full-time jobs in addition to attending high school. These students also never became fully integrated into school life. In many instances, these occurrences manifested themselves by these particular students' having difficulty remembering their teachers' names, much less their influence upon their career expectations.

Finally, one particular organizational factor influenced bright, academically able students not to consider teaching as a career alternative. It was evident that most "gifted and talented" students were "highly tracked"--i.e., continually placed in advanced classes--throughout their public school experience. This organizational arrangement placed them in classes with students very much like themselves. This structural arrangement essentially isolated or segregated their group from other student cliques who were perceived as being less interested in academics and more volatile in terms of their behavior. As one bright chemistry major noted, "The GT classes were where they would take you out and tell you how smart you were." However, for her, when she did take classes such as chorus where "all the cliques were allowed to be together," strong negative impressions of public school teaching developed:

> I could tell from the chorus teacher what I didn't want to be. She was run over [by students] . . . . She had all of them in her class--all the cliques were in there. I never had many classes with them--I know I don't have the mind set to deal with those kinds of people [students in other cliques].

A common pattern was that those students who expressed an unwillingness to work with various types of people in their careers were likely to have been more "highly tracked" and isolated while in the public schools. Subsequently, this organizational arrangement appeared to nurture an intolerance for diversity among these highly tracked students and prompted them to be inclined to want to work only with those like themselves. Schools would not be a conducive work environment for those who would have difficulty with "unpredictable and nonroutine events."

Understanding Teaching

In summary, the variables affecting the teacher labor market and, thus, teaching are far more complex and subtle than most researchers, analysts, and decision makers may believe. Ensuring an adequate supply of competent teachers may involve more factors than providing higher salaries and career ladders. Possibly, researchers, analysts, and decision makers have not picked up on these complexities and subtleties because they have not adequately analyzed the question, "Why do teachers leave?" and they have ignored the question, "Why do teachers stay?" Subsequently, if the solutions to the problems of the teacher labor market are higher salaries and career ladders, then these case studies find very little evidence to support the notion that these solutions are related to the problem, much less the cause. If policy makers are to utilize an insider's perspective that reflects unique local conditions and begin the process of "backwards mapping," then there are specific, subtle, and powerful variables worthy of their consideration. As synthesized from these case studies, these variables include:

-- economic, cultural, and social differences between urban and rural teacher labor markets.

-- low turnover rates and no disproportionate turnover in any particular subject area.

-- mobility patterns in urban areas that tie teachers to their spouses and their nuclear families.

-- mobility patterns in rural areas that tie teachers to their communities and their extended families.

-- the reentering of former teachers into other school systems due to spouse moves, child rearing, and graduate school.

-- limited (if any) marketing and inactive recruiting by universities and school systems for education students and teachers.

-- the fact that school systems, due to budget processes, internal policies (especially transfer), and certification standards have little flexibility in managing the recruitment and selection processes (those systems, i.e., urban, with more locally paid teaching positions have more flexibility).

-- the prevalence of school systems to select teachers with altruistic characteristics, coaching skills, and attitudes and expectations that fit into the community.

-- the desire of many teachers to have work schedules to fit their family life styles and expectations and to have an occupation in which they work with either children or adolescents.

-- the primary importance of student discipline, counter-productive parental attitudes regarding teacher authority, and poor administrative support (regarding student discipline, burdensome paperwork, and extracurricular duties).

-- the fact that (1) bright students were "turned on" by a love of academics, the pursuit of an intellectual life, and professional autonomy so that they might achieve varied and altruistic career goals, and (2) public school teaching was not perceived as being able to provide a conducive atmosphere where they could "think, analyze, and be creative" in their work.

-- the fact that (1) particular organizational arrangements that segregate students, (2) social interactions that limited student commitments to their schools, and (3) the day-to-day pedagogy of their teachers and professors inhibited students' willingness to consider teaching as a career alternative.

-- a committed, yet in many cases, an alienated teacher work force.

-- and, most significantly, the importance of role models for career identification in teaching and the occurrence of negative role modeling by present teachers and educators for students.

Strategies for Effective Policy Makers

Any recommendations offered to attract and retain quality public school teachers must reflect an understanding of the diverse contexts manifested in urban and rural locations as described by these case studies. The teacher labor markets surrounding school systems vary along economic, geographic, and cultural dimensions as local definitions of what constitutes a quality work force are translated into specific everyday needs, limitations, and actions. Given the diversity that exists among the teacher labor markets, the following policy strategies are offered for consideration:

1. School systems need to become more knowledgeable of and sensitive to labor market forces indigenous to their locales. By systematically utilizing data regarding where teachers come from, why they leave, and other potential applicant pools, school systems can begin to market themselves in order to influence the labor market in their areas. Government must provide incentives for school systems to become more proactive and flexible in their approaches to attracting and retaining teachers.

2. School systems should examine how their existing internal policies are affecting the recruitment and hiring process.

3. Urban school systems (with nearby industry and universities) have added capability to attract teachers who are not now choosing to teach. They can:

   - promote the hiring of able, but noncertified, teachers and assist them in receiving certification while they are teaching;
   - work with industry to recruit spouses of employees transferring into the locale; and
   - recruit and hire capable college graduates in high-demand areas (such as math, science, and special education) for short-term periods and, in turn, pay for their master's degrees and help place them in local industries.

4. Rural school systems can market the benefits of nonurban

living much as industry does in attracting talented graduates to their rural industrial sites.

5. Currently, school systems select many teachers on the basis of nonacademic criteria. Given the auxiliary and extracurricular functions required by schools, staff support for teachers needs to be expanded.

6. To recruit those presently not choosing to teach, school systems must attend to the school milieu that presently frustrates and alienates teachers. Poor school climate discourages positive role models for public school students who are the teacher candidate pool of tomorrow. It is possible for schools to systematically identify, encourage, and recruit high school students who are currently not choosing to teach. In fact, the Teacher Cadet Program, initiated by Winthrop College (South Carolina), is an excellent example of a systematic response to undo the negative image of public school teaching for today's students.

7. If teaching is to attract and retain talented individuals, working conditions must permit greater teacher control and fewer bureaucratic intrusions, and policies must provide easier access for short-term teachers.

8. Policy makers must be cognizant that many talented individuals are not well-suited for the myriad of interpersonal and communicative skills required of effective public school teachers.

9. If policy makers want to attract certain types of talented individuals to teaching, they will need to make certain organizational changes. For example, teachers should be allowed some choice regarding their own classes, materials, and disciplinary measures, as well as their level of participation in extracurricular activities. However, it should be recognized that students, teachers, and administrators have considered the best teachers to be ones who were "always available" and fully involved in both the academic and psychological development of students.

10. If career ladders are to have a positive impact on the teacher labor market, then local systems and state education agencies need to address the divergent mobility patterns between urban and rural teachers.

11. Teacher pay needs to be increased, but not because of its potential direct effect on the labor market. Rather, it is a direct expression of how society values education and teaching.

Obviously, qualitative research leads to dramatically different policy implications. These studies appear to confirm Rosenholtz's (1985)

assertion that the problems of teaching have been inadequately diagnosed. In fact, Charters (1967) asserted almost two decades ago that "the obvious facts about the teaching career are not so obvious after all" (p. 182). Qualitative research, concerned as it is with the social context, the salient perspectives of insiders, and crucial "local knowledge" (Geertz, 1983), offers a means to provide a better understanding of the teacher labor market. This qualitative analysis of the dynamics of the teacher labor market suggests that problems-causes-solutions are embedded within the context of the settings under study. As the pressure mounts to enact and implement policies to attract, reward, and retain quality teachers, it is hoped that decision makers will utilize information based on this methodological and analytical framework.

In conclusion, policy reforms have focused primarily on modest alterations in the present salary and occupational structure of the public schools. Yet, the sole addition of increased (but limited) pecuniary rewards and opportunities for advancement for teachers may have an adverse effect on the teacher labor market. The modest increases in teacher salaries and changes in career structures that presently are proposed would most likely attract not the brightest to teaching--only those who would be willing to tolerate undisciplined students, incompetent administrators, uncooperative parents, bureaucratic intrusions, burdensome paper work, and a myriad of extracurricular duties for financial gain (as compared to their present jobs). Subsequently, policies such as career ladders and incentive pay may very well attract those whom we say we do not want in the public school classroom. On the other hand, those bright, talented, professionally oriented individuals who we say we do want would not be attracted by these incremental changes in the financial and occupational structure of

the public schools. Likewise, many of these talented individuals do not hold attitudes and expectations that would fit into either present or proposed structural arrangments. This conclusion is not surprising given the subtle, yet powerful factors that influence the supply and demand of public school teachers. However, with a more systematic understanding of schooling, teaching, and teachers, policy makers may very well not only be able to retain and satisfy quality teachers, but also to tap into a new pool of talented individuals who could fit into schools and communities under the "right" conditions. Albeit, policy makers would be wise not to rely solely on rational economic incentives to increase the size of this potential pool. Efforts to achieve this would require subtle and inter-related policies. Surely, our public schools and our students deserve such efforts.

References

Berry, B. A Case Study of the Teacher Labor Market in the Southeast, Occasional Paper 413. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, 1984.

Berry, B. A Case Study of Teacher Attrition in the Southeast, Occasional Paper 414. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, 1985(a).

Berry, B. Case Studies of the Career Expectations of Noneducation College Seniors in the Southeast, Occasional Paper 419. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, 1985(b).

Bird, R. Report and Evaluation of Current Information Regarding Teacher Supply and Demand, Occasional Paper 8. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, 1984.

Charters, W. W. "Some Obvious Facts About the Teaching Career." Educational Administration Quarterly 13 (1967): 182-189.

Elmore, R., and McLaughlin, M. W. "Strategic Choice in Federal Education Policy: The Compliance-Assistance Trade-Off." In A. Lieberman and M. W. McLaughlin, eds., Policymaking in Education. Eighty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Darling-Hammond, L. Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching. Washington: The Rand Corporation, 1984.

Geertz, C. Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

McLaughlin, M. W., et al. State Policy and Teaching Excellence. Stanford University: Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, 1985.

Newman, F. "Excerpts from Newman's Report on Higher Education Policy." The Chronicle of Higher Education 31 (1985): 17-29.

Patton, F. G. Good Morning, Miss Dove. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1954.

Rosenholtz, S. "Political Myths About Education Reform: Lessons from Research on Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (1985): 349-355.

Schlechty, P. C., and Vance, V. "Recruitment, Selection, and Retention: The Shape of the Teaching Force." Elementary School Journal 83 (1983): 469-487.

Sykes, G., and Devaney, K. "A Blight on the Apple for Teacher." Education and Urban Society 17 (1985): 243-249.

Weaver, T. America's Teacher Quality Problem: Alternatives for Reform. New York: Praeger, 1983.